

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13. Applicant has added new claim 14. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-14.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Angle et al. (US 6,771,596 B1) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,747,971 B1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner appears to address only Applicant's "(page 6 of arguments)" and "(page 7 of arguments)." Applicant submits the Examiner appears not to have considered pages 5 and 8 of Applicant's previously submitted arguments. Applicant submits the Examiner continues to fail to allege teaching or suggestion in the prior art of each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Regarding claims 1, 6 and 10, Applicant submits the Examiner alleges the cited portion of the cited reference discloses "Making a second request for a second unit of traffic having a second priority lower than the first priority and being destined to the first output port, for scheduling transmission of the first unit of traffic to the switch fabric (column 7, line 37-67 wherein requests are made in decreasing order of priority to the switch fabric)." However, Applicant submits the Examiner fails to allege any teaching or suggestion in the cited references as to "using, by the first line card, a first grant received from the switch fabric permitting transmission of the first unit of the traffic to the switch fabric and issued in response to a second request made for a second unit of the traffic having a second priority lower than the first priority and being destined to the first output port, for scheduling transmission of the first unit of the traffic to the switch fabric." Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Also, Applicant submits the Examiner fails to allege any teaching or suggestion in the cited references as to "...the first line card further configured to utilize a first grant of the grants corresponding to a first request of the requests, wherein the first request is of a lower priority than a second request of the requests, for transmitting a first unit of the traffic corresponding to the second request to the switch fabric." Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 6. Further, Applicant submits the Examiner fails to allege any teaching or suggestion in the cited references as to "a second means configured to utilize a first grant of the grants corresponding to

a first request of the requests, wherein the first request is of a lower priority than a second request of the requests, for transmitting a first unit of the traffic corresponding to the second request to the switch fabric." Thus, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to claims 1, 6, and 10. Applicant submits claims 1, 6, and 10 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claim 2. While the Examiner cites "(column 5, lines 6-17 wherein the scheduling method comprises a second grant phase in response to a request for second data transfer)" of the Hughes reference as allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claim 2, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the subject matter of claim 2 is not directed to "a second grant phase in response to a request for second data transfer," as the Examiner alleges. Rather, Applicant notes claim 2 is directed to "...using the second grant issued in response to the first request for scheduling transmission of the second unit of the traffic to the switch fabric." As the Examiner fails to allege such teaching in the cited references, Applicant submits the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to the subject matter of claim 2. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claim 3. Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 1, from which claim 3 depends. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 3 is also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference teach away from the subject matter of claim 4. Applicant notes claim 4 depends from claim 1. Applicant notes claim 1 recites "...a first request for transmitting a first unit of the traffic of a first priority..." and "...a second request made for a second unit of the traffic having a second priority lower than the first priority...." Applicant notes the Examiner cites "(column 7, line 37-67 wherein requests are made in decreasing order of priority to the switch fabric)." Applicant notes such alleged teaching teaches away from "...wherein the first line card sends the first request after the second request." Applicant submits the subject matter of claim 4 is not a predictable variation of the alleged teachings of the cited references. Thus, Applicant submits claim 4 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 5, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claim 5. While the Examiner cites "(column 16, lines 4-30 wherein a plurality of requests associated with a plurality of priorities are received and the set of requests with the highest priority class of service level is granted)" of the Angle reference as allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claim 5, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the cited portion of the cited reference fails to disclose "wherein the first line card sends a first set of requests of a highest priority of a plurality of priorities, with the first set of requests corresponding to a first quantity of the traffic in an amount of guaranteed traffic flow serviced by the first line card, and sends a second set of requests of a lower priority of the priorities for a second quantity of the traffic." For example, Applicant sees not teaching of "with the first set of requests corresponding to a first quantity of the traffic in an amount of guaranteed traffic flow serviced by the first line card" or even any mention of "guaranteed traffic flow" in the cited portion of the cited reference. Moreover, Applicant submits the alleged teaching cited by the Examiner teaches away from the subject matter of claim 5. Applicant notes claim 5 depends from claim 1, which recites, "...a first grant received from the switch fabric permitting transmission of the first unit of the traffic to the switch fabric and issued in response to a second request made for a second unit of the traffic having a second priority lower than the first priority...." Accordingly, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness with respect to the subject matter of claim 5. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 7 and 11, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claims 7 and 11. While the Examiner cites "(column 15, lines 27-38 wherein grants corresponding to specific request are mapped into grant frames for data transmission)," of the Hughes reference as allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claims 7 and 11, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "wherein the first line card is further configured to utilize the first grant for transmitting the first unit of the traffic so as to conform to a latency criterion pertaining to a first data stream comprising the first unit of the traffic" and "wherein the second means is further configured to utilize the first grant for transmitting the first unit of the traffic so as to conform to a latency criterion pertaining to a first data stream comprising the first unit of the traffic." For example, Applicant sees not teaching in the cited portion of the cited reference as to "... so as to conform to a latency criterion pertaining to a first data stream comprising the first unit of the traffic." Therefore, Applicant submits claims 7 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 8 and 12, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claims 8 and 12. While the Examiner cites "column 15, lines 27-38 wherein grants corresponding to specific request are mapped into grant frames for data transmission," of the Hughes reference as allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claims 8 and 12, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "wherein the first line card is further configured to utilize a second grant of the grants corresponding to the second request for transmitting a second unit of traffic corresponding to the first request to the switch fabric" and "wherein the second means is further configured to utilize a second grant of the grants corresponding to the second request for transmitting a second unit of traffic corresponding to the first request to the switch fabric." Therefore, Applicant submits claims 8 and 12 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claims 9 and 13. While the Examiner cites "(column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 24 wherein primary requests are processed before secondary requests)," of the Hughes reference as allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claims 9 and 13, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "wherein the first line card is further configured to issue the first request prior to the second request" and "wherein the first means is further configured to issue the first request prior to the second request." For example, Applicant submits the Examiner appears to be attempting characterize "primary requests" as allegedly teaching "the first request" and "secondary requests" as allegedly teaching "the second request." However, Applicant notes Hughes et al. state in col. 12, lines 30-37, "A unicast queue (e.g., unicast queue 512a) typically generates, in a round robin fashion, a total number of service requests per clock tick equal to the total number of queued cells and, furthermore, typically generates one primary request (corresponding to the head of line cell) with the remaining requests (corresponding to the non head of line cells) being secondary." Thus, Applicant submits the teachings of the Hughes reference depart from what the Examiner appears to allege. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 9 and 13 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding new claim 14, Applicant submits the cited portions of the cited references fail to disclose "performing grant substitution." Thus, Applicant submits claim 14 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

01/28/2008



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.  
PO Box 164075  
Austin, Texas 78716-4075  
(512) 347-9223 (phone)  
(512) 347-9224 (fax)